

**LAKE MINNETONKA CONSERVATION DISTRICT
BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

7:00 P.M., November 9, 2016
Wayzata City Hall

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Green called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. ROLL CALL

Members present: Jay Green, Mound; Chris Jewett, Deephaven; Gregg Thomas, Tonka Bay; Dan Baasen, Wayzata; Ann Hoelscher, Victoria; Gary Hughes, Spring Park; Gabriel Jabbour, Orono; Dennis Klohs, Minnetonka Beach; Fred Meyer, Woodland; Gregg Prest, Excelsior; Rob Roy, Greenwood; and, Sue Shuff, Minnetonka. Also present: Vickie Schleuning, Executive Director; Emily Herman, Administrative Assistant; and Troy Gilchrist, LMCD Legal Counsel.

Members absent: Bret Niccum, Minnetrista and Deborah Zorn, Shorewood.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION: Jabbour moved, Shuff seconded to approve the agenda as submitted.

VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

5. CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no chair announcements.

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES- 10/26/16 LMCD Regular Board Meeting

Green referred to Item 7C, second paragraph, and stated it should read, "...Gilchrist was directed to reconsider the draft ordinance based on lineal measurements of the ~~deck fingers~~ slip itself and not the square footage of the envelope/footprint."

MOTION: Roy moved, Meyer seconded to approve the 10/26/16 LMCD Regular Board Meeting minutes as amended.

VOTE: Ayes (9), Abstained (3, Baasen, Hoelscher, and Jewett); motion carried.

7. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

MOTION: Prest moved, Hughes seconded to approve the consent agenda as presented. Items so approved included: **7A)** Audit of Vouchers (11/1/16 – 11/15/16); **7B)** September financial summary and balance sheet.

VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

8. PUBLIC COMMENTS- Persons in attendance, subjects not on the agenda (limited to 5 minutes)

There were no public comments.

9. PUBLIC HEARING

A) 5th Street Ventures, new multiple dock license application to maintain the existing 13 boat storage units and to add an additional 28 utilizing the Qualified Commercial Marina ordinance, located at 4681 Shoreline Drive in Spring Park (Seton Lake)

Herman stated she and Director Schleuning would be presenting on this application. Herman directed the Board to the staff memo, dated 11/4/16, and respective attachments. She provided a detailed overview of this agenda item, as outlined below, via a PowerPoint presentation:

- The currently approved license;
- The proposed expansion and the completion of an Environmental Assessment Worksheet that resulted in a negative declaration on the need of an Environmental Impact Statement;
- Relevant LMCD Code Sections;
- Historical licensing of the site from its purchase by 5th Street Ventures, LLC in 2002 through the current license. This overview provided for actions taken in 2010 to confirm if the now currently licensed site would have: 1) fit into the area, 2) impacted the wetlands adjacent to the dock structures, and 3) the identification of proper water level depths. Reports relative to those questions were historically presented and provided within this Board packet.
- The review of a bog adjacent to the site; its dislodged in 2014 due to high waters and the current placement that provided for a greater dock use area for the applicant from its original location. Staff provided historical aerials of the bog's placement via the PowerPoint and within the packet and 2) reviewed consequences that could be placed upon the applicant if the bog broke loose and floated into the licensed site.
- An overview of the public hearing process (legal requirement, established process, and purpose);
- Public comments - review and comments were solicited from the MN DNR and City of Spring Park (no comments were received). Staff received a request to meet with several residents which was held. Concerns raised included water depths, navigational safety, noise/inappropriate behavior, reduction in property values, lighting, and lack of notification of public hearing notice (confirmed by staff notice was mailed). It was noted that a spokesperson for this group may be present to speak under public comments.

Schleuning continued via the following outline of her comments:

- The code provides for both technical (defined setbacks, length, etc) and a list of nine additional review criteria (2.03, Subd. 3) for the Board's consideration. She confirmed the applicant had met the technical criteria of the code; however, staff had concerns relative to two of the following additional review criteria:

Quality and ecology of the Lake

- backing the boats near the existing wetland and bog (proposed boat storage units ((BSU)) 38-41)
- recent movement of section of bog that has broken off and currently within the proposed construction area (current Findings do not allow construction to intrude into, damage, or remove wetlands).

Obstructs or occupies too great an area of the public water in relationship to its utility to the general public

- channel navigational concerns with the western extension of proposed BSUs 13,14,27,28,29, and 30, as well as respective walkways
- further review of south channel restriction
- consideration of high traffic site visits

Source of nuisance or annoyance to persons in the vicinity

- no documentation that staff is aware of at both the LMCD and police enforcement level
 - address current lighting and lack of "no parking signs"
- Staff recommended the Board continue the Public Hearing to December 14th to allow staff time to research and appropriately assess any Public Hearing comments and direct staff to send notification of the 60-day extension rule.
 - She entertained questions and comments from the Board.

Klohs inquired if any of the bog had been removed. Schleuning stated it does not appear to have been removed, but its shape and location have changed.

Jabbour inquired what protection is there for the bog since it is up to the property owner to move it. Schleuning stated a permit is needed to do any changes with a bog and there are specific requirements attached to the permit. Hoelscher advised a permit is required to remove aquatic vegetation.

Thomas stated the application before them did not propose to remove any vegetation, including the bog, or to dredge.

Hughes commented there is no record of any permit taken for moving the bog in that area.

Green referred to currently approved Findings of Fact and Order, and inquired about watercraft not using south channel except in emergencies. Both Green and staff believed that restriction referred to a historically existing channel to the west of the bog that is no longer in existence.

Seeing no further questions, Green invited the applicant to address the Board.

Mr. Joel Bутtenhoff, owner of 5th Street Ventures, LLC provided the following comments: 1) he sees his request for additional slips as reasonable from a density standpoint, 2) they designed the slips in a way that is not encroaching on the channel, 3) they had nothing to do with the bog that broke away, 4) the only complaint he has received from neighbors is for lighting which he further expounded on, 5) the company has done a good job managing the slips for the past 14 years, 6) he would consider providing for restroom amenities, and 7) the marina provided a good value to the Lake users.

A few questions were asked of the applicant who confirmed he would be willing to work with a wetland specialist to address staff's concerns and that all storage would be seasonal, overnight.

Green opened the Public Hearing at 7:27 p.m.

Richard Wigner and Robert Carlson of 2332 and 2350 Driftwood Lane in Mound, respectively, spoke on behalf of some of the neighboring residents. They provided a handout for the record entitled, "5th Street Ventures - Add 28 boat slips – LMCD Findings Report – Existing Commercial Marina," dated 11/7/16. He provided a detailed overview of the handout. A summary of his comments made, via a PowerPoint presentation, are as follows:

- The mission of the LMCD was read and they thanked past and present Board members for keeping the Lake safe;
- Believed consideration of navigational safety in Seton channel should be a top priority. They have requested a boat study of the channel from the Sheriff's Office which is pending. However, they had received a report from the Sheriff's Office that showed a proven track record of poor behavior of boaters from 5th Street Ventures;
- Acknowledgment that there is a pub going in that area and it was unclear if there would be transient docking included.
- Addressed the historical and present location of the bog and cattails in the area. It was noted that when the bog broke loose in 2014, it was relocated in a position that allowed this application for the proposed dock expansion to be considered.
- Additional concerns raised included: light pollution, inadequate supervision, unavailable restroom facilities, and transient docking.
- An online petition was initiated that has received 156 signatures within 24 hours.
- A request was made to move the bog back to its original position and that the Board table the application until further studies can be completed.

Scott Gaylord, 2352 Driftwood Lane in Mound, commented when the bog broke lose, it was hastily put back to open up the channel and questioned why it was not put back in its original location. He expressed the following additional concerns: 1) water depths for the proposed marina (damage to the

Lake bottom by props), 2) safety through the channel; the addition of 28 more docks in an already congested area creates a safety hazard and a boat density study needs to be done on the channel, 3) violation of minimum wake in the area (not enough Water Patrol), 4) blind intersection by the bridge area, 5) distracted watercraft operators, 6) recent record in Boating While Intoxicated violations, 7) the marina "shooting for the stars," 8) recommended boat density study.

Stephen Babcock, 3585 Tuxedo Road in Mound, concurred with the previous speakers, presented pictures of the channel to the Board, and commented that the area is too congested for additional docks.

Green closed the Public Hearing at 8:00 p.m.

Gilchrist advised the Board that if they decide to continue the Public Hearing to the next meeting, the Chair has the option to reopen it.

Jabbour commented overlapping jurisdiction can be confusing and requested the Board inform the residents what is within its authority regarding this application. The Board can address concerns regarding safety, location of the dock, and rights of the shoreline, but other issues regarding the bog and potential dredging are dealt with by other agencies. He shared concerns for encroaching into the channel and commented the Board could approve this application with conditions.

Green concurred with Jabbour. He added there are also lily pads throughout the area and the boats at the docks closest to them would chew them up.

Hughes compared this to a parking situation and stated a City would not put parking lots and meters in the middle of a road. He suggested reducing the number of slips so that boats are not parked in the way of boating traffic (providing a visual of his recommendation via the overhead).

Thomas recommended a continuation to allow staff to work with the applicant and neighbors to come up with a solution. He stated there is less concern with proposed docks closer to shore. This provides more people with access to the Lake, but not at the cost of safety. Public nuisance is an issue in other places on the Lake and is difficult to address.

Prest commented it is not up to the Board to address issues like lighting and public nuisance, but he encouraged the applicant to work with the neighbors on these types of issues.

Baasen commented the LMCD Code shows that commercial marinas cannot impede navigation and suggested the discussion be continued at the December 14, 2016 meeting.

MOTION: Prest moved, Jabbour seconded to continue the Public Hearing of 5th Street Ventures, LLC new multiple dock license to the December 14, 2016 Regular Board meeting.

VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION: Thomas moved, Hughes seconded to authorize staff to submit, by law, a 60-day extension letter to the applicant.

VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

B) Jacob Bolinger, density variance application at 3116 Westedge Boulevard in Mound (Halsted Bay)

Herman directed the Board to the staff memo, dated 11/4/16. She stated Mr. Jacob Bolinger has submitted a density variance application for the storage of one additional restricted watercraft at 3116 Westedge Boulevard in Mound. The site is listed as residential, two-unit with 64 feet of 929.4 feet of shoreline. She provided an overview of the application via a PowerPoint presentation as follows:

- The applicant proposes to install a 3.6' x 48' dock structure for the storage of one watercraft on each side (providing for conforming side setbacks and dock length). The applicant would remove the existing dock structure.
- Background information on the site provided for the following:
 - The shoreline was originally associated with 3016 Westedge Boulevard.
 - In 2005 the prior owner applied and received approval for a dock parcel subdivision request. Three dock parcel lots individually combined with three residential, two unit lots across the public right-a-way (3140, 3130, and 3116 Westedge Road) were created.
 - During that application process, LMCD staff submitted a letter, dated 1/4/05, documenting the property owners would have to comply with LMCD rules and regulations; specifically watercraft storage density (each site would have the ability to dock or moor one restricted watercraft even if the property was multi-unit).
- The practical difficulties documented by Mr. Bolinger included: 1) his inability to utilize his existing dock for the storage of two boats, 2) that he purchased the property with the belief that it provided two boats slips (one for each unit) based on the MLS listing and through the represented agent, and 3) that his tenant that resides in the other unit had a two year lease allotting him the boat slip.
- The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MN DNR) and the City of Mound were provided copies of the application. No written comments were received; however, the City of Mound verbally stated they would support the LMCD's decision.
- An overview of relevant LMCD Code Sections was provided.
- Staff recommends denial of the variance based on: 1) not meeting the definition of "practical difficulties," 2) potential increased density and negative consequences to bay and lake-wide basis, and 3) setting precedent (staff is not aware of prior LMCD variance approved for density greater than allowed by Code).
- She entertained questions and comments from the Board.

Herman responded to a few Board questions by clarifying the following: 1) if the site maintained a single family dwelling and the Board believed the distance of the home from the dock lot across the public right-of-way met the intent of the code, the site could dock or moor up to four restricted watercraft (all four boats would need to be owned and registered to individuals that live at the site and stored within the defined dock use area), 2) the letter referenced by LMCD staff to the City of Mound in 2005 was within the packet and provided to the applicant, and 3) that the practical difficulties offered in the presentation were from the applicant and not staff.

Green invited the applicant to address the Board.

Jacob Bolinger, 3116 Westedge Boulevard in Mound stated he purchased the duplex property under the assumption it had two boat slips. He has since discovered that the Code did not provide for such storage and that the tenant in the other unit already had a lease in place that provided for a boat slip through 2019. He stated he is in law enforcement and that it was important to him not to violate the ordinance. He provided an overview of the site and the proposed dock and watercraft placement. He was hoping to sway the Board to approve one additional watercraft so that he did not have to trailer his craft in and out.

Green opened the Public Hearing at 8:29 p.m.

No additional comments were offered and the Public Hearing was closed at 8:30 p.m.

The Board discussed a variety of options in considering this request, including the consideration of the density ordinance during the re-codification process. There was expressed concern that there were many other properties similar to this situation throughout the Lake and that this matter, if considered, should be considered by an ordinance amendment.

MOTION: Prest moved, Jabbour seconded to direct the attorney to prepare Findings of Fact and Order to deny Jacob Bolinger density variance application for 3116 Westedge Boulevard in Mound.

VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

10. OTHER BUSINESS

A) **Save the Lake Staff Support**, report and discussion

Schleuning directed the Board to a staff memo, dated 11/4/2016, and presented a cost analysis chart that shows the estimated hours and costs by function for 2015 and 2016 through November 1, 2016 for Save the Lake support staff. The cost for 2015 was \$10,477.60 and for 2016 year to date, it is \$3,274.39.

Schleuning advised the chart was set up by function to make it easier to identify costs and she could estimate previous year's cost not included on this chart.

Baasen commented he read the minutes and found there were some board members that felt Save the Lake was acting in secret. He noted every meeting Save the Lake has is posted and everyone is invited to attend. All expenditures are submitted to the Board for approval. The boater safety education pilot program course was in 2013 and there have been seven sessions in total. He stated Save the Lake provides an outlet for people who care about the Lake, support to the LMCD, and functions that could not be utilized with levied funds. There was previous discussion that Save the Lake should be a standalone entity with revenue and expenses, but implementation has not happened due to leadership changes with the LMCD. He expressed concern in withholding solicitation letters, as it may impair service to the Lake. He would like to understand the concerns of

the Board, and address them so that they can proceed as a Committee.

Green stated there was concern with staff time being spent on other activities. He clarified the Committee was asked to withhold the allocation of funds letter, not the solicitation letter.

Jabbour commented he attended Save the Lake meetings and there is no secrecy associated with it. His concern is for the Committee to be a responsible, transparent government and suggested a forensic audit be done on the last seven years.

Schleuning referred to the Cost Estimate Analysis and explained there are benefits included in the amount, but it does not reflect overtime or overhead costs. The amounts vary by tasks in each program area. The solar lights were based off previous reports and estimated staff time.

Jabbour requested clarification on the cost for solicitation. Schleuning explained in 2015, 6,200 letters were sent out at a cost of \$960.38. This amount includes staff time, but not the hard cost expenses. Hard cost expenses, such as postage, were already paid by Save the Lake through the Board's approval of the audit of vouchers (offering the code of "STL" reflecting the payment source).

Thomas inquired about forensic audits and stated he thought it was okay for them to use staff time for Save the Lake activities. Gilchrist stated the discussion is more about equities and what pot they should be expended from. One comment Gilchrist made during a prior work session was that he understood some of the Board members viewed Save the Lake as separate from the LMCD. He reaffirmed that the Save the Lake Committee is a body of this body; their funds are LMCD funds. He believed the concern was not whether something was legal or not but what pot the funds should be expended from. It is a policy decision for the Board to determine which funds should be applied to different things.

Baasen stated Save the Lake was a function that handled their expenses in the way that was acceptable to the Board and now it is not acceptable, all the way back seven years. The Committee met this morning and discussed the documented \$10,000 in estimated costs, as well as Jabbour's suggestion that it would be a benefit to the community if Save the Lake funds were used for the re-codification process. He believed that if the contributions were utilized in a manner that was not previously advertised, Save the Lake would be in a position to investigate Save the Lake's integrity in going back to solicited contributions. To this end, the Committee suggested the Board transfer \$15,000 from Save the Lake reserves for 2015 and 2016 expenses. Additionally, it needs to be disclosed that Save the Lake funds are going toward re-codification.

Green referred to the seven years, and stated it is not just a matter of cost, but also a way to see if more staff time is needed.

Jabbour commented it is up to the Board to find the integrity to admit if something was done wrong and fix it by reimbursing the funds. That was done with Shorewood Yacht Club and Save the Lake when he believed the budgets were done wrong. He was disappointed as he believed that via a meeting with Baasen an agreement was made to suggest the reimbursement of a certain amount of funds from Save the Lake to the General Fund. That suggestion is now not being portrayed. To this end, he expects the Board to reimburse it. The seven

years was offered via the statute of limitations. The Board can reimburse to the beginning of time or consider merging the funds into one this evening.

Prest commented Save the Lake is not its own legal entity, but is legally part of the LMCD body; confirming it is an assumed name by the Secretary of State only.

Schleuning stated Save the Lake is not a 501c3. It is operating as part of the LMCD. It is registered for the name LMCD Save the Lake and LMCD Save the Lake logo.

Prest reaffirmed that legally it is part of this body. He stated it does not feel right that Save the Lake would transfer funds for re-codification. If money is needed for re-codification, it should come out of the reserve, which includes the Save the Lake money

Baasen stated some of the funds are restricted.

Prest stated restricted funds are not detailed in our financial accounting and offered that any such funds needed to be detailed out.

Baasen explained there are three reserve funds that include AIS, LMCD, and Save the Lake. They are invested together, but identified separately. People donate to Save the Lake because they want their donation specific to the safety and quality of the lake, not to the administrative costs of an organization.

Hoelscher commented Save the Lake provides services that cannot come out of the levy. It is important to identify what those things are and be transparent about it. Save the Lake is a great enhancement to LMCD and going forward, it is important to be clear on money coming in and what money is being spent on.

Jewett commented Save the Lake was loose accounting and they are making an effort to tighten it up. The rules are not being changed, as they should have had good accounting practices in place seven years ago. Save the Lake is a good committee and they should move forward with it.

Baasen stated everything Save the Lake has spent has been approved by the Board. Jewett explained there is a cost for staff time and that has not been approved such as staff time for Save the Lake banquet.

Green stated there are two options for Save the Lake: 1) consider the forensic audit and what the amount of transfer should be or 2) utilize specific amount of funds for re-codification.

Hoelscher offered a third option is to change the policy going forward; based on confirmation that the Board has not done anything wrong.

Jabbour stated they could take \$80,000 for re-codification out of Save the Lake reserve to the General Fund reserve. He expressed concern in paying staff time for the maintenance of solar lights because it is taking money out of the citizen's pocket and giving it to Hennepin County.

Shuff inquired as to how that number was reached as transparency was documented as a high priority.

Jabbour moved to take \$80,000 out of Save the Lake and put it into the general fund or merge all the funds. He withdrew the motion.

MOTION: Prest moved, Jabbour seconded to merge all LMCD unrestricted funds into one fund.

Prest commented with this motion, a forensic audit is not needed and additional staff time will not be wasted.

Hoelscher inquired if it is still possible to keep track of donations designated for specific projects with Save the Lake if the funds are merged.

Thomas commented the code of ordinances is the core of operations for LMCD. The Board can keep track of what is donated, but it may be best to specify they are going to everyday activities. He believed that tax levied funds should pay for core activities with Save the Lake contributions to special programs.

Prest stated they could keep track of donations separately. When the money is spent on things that are good for raising money, those should be included in the fundraising letter.

Hoelscher inquired if some of the money from fundraising could be used for milfoil harvesting. Prest responded it would have to be approved by the Board.

Shuff concurred that the LMCD's integrity is on the line as there is a large amount of funds within the current Save the Lake Reserve Fund that had previously been solicited for specialty type programs.

Baasen commented if \$80,000 is taken out of the fund, they will only be able to pay for the sheriff. He is not opposed to merging the funds, but his main concern is with the integrity of the donors.

Hughes questioned if this would affect the presentation to the member cities. Prest stated the LMCD will have a Save the Lake budget.

Jabbour asked who was present at the Save the Lake Committee meeting this morning. In confirming Jay Soule was not present, Jabbour stated he will take strong issue with him on this matter.

VOTE: Ayes, (10); Nays (2, Baasen and Shuff); motion carried.

B) Initiation of re-codification contract with Kennedy and Graven, Chartered

- Begin January 2017
- Discussion of use of Save the Lake Reserve Funds

Schleuning stated they are looking at amending the time frame and beginning in January 2017. Additionally, she stated: 1) the LMCD currently has a contract with Kennedy and Graven, Charter, she confirmed with Gilchrist that a separate contract for this project was not needed and 2) she is working with Gilchrist on ways to

streamline this process to keep the costs down.

Gilchrist commented he has not been told to start the re-codification process yet, but he can start anytime. There is more time to do these types of projects over the winter than in the summer.

MOTION: Prest moved, Jabbour seconded to begin the re-codification project immediately and any monies that exceed the current budgeted amount will come out of reserves.

VOTE: Ayes (10), Nays (2, Baasen and Shuff); motion carried.

Green stated that this agenda item referenced the use of Save the Lake reserve funds for consideration in funding the re-codification process. Based on the approved motion for 10A, this agenda item is a voided matter.

C) Approval of 2017 LMCD Employee Benefit Package

Schleuning directed the Board to the staff memo, dated 11/4/16 and reported on the following:

- A need to approve the Employee Benefits package for 2017.
- An overview on the Employee Benefits package and process, which generally starts mid-year.
- Health insurance increased 11.5% for 2017, and the budget allowed for a 10% increase.
- An alternative plan is available that would reduce the rate from \$533 to \$478 for medical insurance, but included deductibles and out of pocket expenses that have not been there in the past.
- Lastly, she inquired if the Board would like her to consider other insurance options for next year, i.e., health savings plans, higher deductibles, etc.

Shuff inquired if the agency has the ability to implement a health savings plan. Schleuning stated not for 2017 due to the process that was initiated earlier in the year.

Hoelscher commented she was uncomfortable making benefits more expensive for staff on such short notice and inquired how the overage could be paid for by the LMCD. Schleuning stated it will come out of reserves.

Shuff believed staff has gone above and beyond this year and recommended the health insurance be funded at the higher rate (\$4,800 shortfall) with the overage taken out of reserves.

MOTION: Prest moved, Thomas seconded to approve the 2017 Employee Benefits Package maintaining the current health insurance as last year by taking the \$4,800 shortfall out of the reserve fund for 2017. Furthermore, Prest volunteered to assist staff in the renegotiation of employee benefits during 2017 for 2018.

VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

11. UPDATE FROM STANDING LMCD COMMITTEES

Baasen offered Save the Lake Committee met and requested clarification if the solicitation letter could be sent out.

MOTION: Green moved, Baasen seconded to allow Save the Lake to send out a solicitation letter.

VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

Baasen stated they are willing to send out grant requests as well, but the Committee feels it should wait until the Board makes other decisions concerning the use of the grants. Green concurred.

Green provided an update on aquatic invasive species: 1) there are now seven lakes with Starry Stonewort and they are trying to figure out where it came from; 2) the Wisconsin and Minnesota DNR's will conduct a "bioblitz" along the border waters looking for infestations in the spring; and, 3) a new invasive invertebrate was found in Lake Erie.

Jabbour commented there is a chance the lakes have been infested with Starry Stonewort for several years and there is no way to know how to kill it. Also, he is trying to get new legislation passed on an operator permit where safety is primary, and he is concerned with the turnover of the legislators. Dr. Sorensen of the U of M is taking a one year sabbatical.

12. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR UPDATE

Schleuning reported on the following two items: First, she attended a meeting regarding Wayzata Lake Effect. They have a final concept plan and have hired someone to begin fundraising. Second, renewal applications are being processed and will be heading out the door shortly. She has been receiving positive comments and appreciation for the work the LMCD does.

13. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

14. NEW BUSINESS

Roy commented there is concern amongst the City of Greenwood that de-icing creep is going on and they had asked that matter be brought to the LMCD's attention.

Jabbour commented he believed the salt from the bridge is pushed into the water by the plow and that is what keeps the channel open.

Green stated he will pay attention to it with inspections and take pictures to try and get a handle on it. Schleuning advised they will follow up and provide a report to the Board.

15. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:03 p.m.

James Jay Green, Chair

Gregory J. Thomas, Secretary